

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/648,702	LEGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel A. Hess	2876	

All Participants:

(1) Daniel A. Hess.

(2) Brade Close.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 April 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

1, 18 and 20

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Jared J. Fureman

**JARED J. FUREMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner pointed out that the way the claims refer to the tags in the trunk portion of a tree and the base portion of the tree is confusing. In particular, it would be more clear if the claims referred to a 'first tag' and a 'second tag'. The Applicant agreed to suggest amended claims to remedy this confusion..